

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 15, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 14 and 15 were objected to and have been amended to address the items raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Osterman. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a first computer receiving a text to speech request signal from a phone through an email computer server via a communications network; the first computer configured to generate a first collection of speech generation commands based on a first portion of computer readable information in response to the text to speech request signal.” Support for these features is found in Figure 7A, steps 54 and 56 and paragraphs [0030] – [0031] of Applicant’s specification.

Neither Wu nor Osterman teaches or suggests these features. Wu teaches a system that converts an incoming text message into an audio message. There is no text to speech request signal that the first computer is responsive to as recited in claim 1. Osterman teaches a system for delivering video messages to client devices. Osterman determines if a client device has software necessary for delivery of a multi-media message to the client device. There is no text to speech request signal that the first computer is responsive to as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Wu and Osterman are combined, the elements of claim 1 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Wu in view of Osterman. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over Wu for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claim 7 recites “receiving at a first computer a text to speech request signal from a phone through an email computer server via a communications network; generating a first collection of speech generation commands based on a first portion of computer readable information in a first computer in response to the text to speech request signal.” As discussed above, neither Wu nor Osterman teaches or suggests these features. Claims 9 and

14 depend from claim 7 and are patentable over Wu in view of Osterman for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 7.

Claim 15 recites “receiving at a first computer a text to speech request signal from a phone through an email computer server via a communications network; generating a first collection of speech generation commands based on computer readable information in a first computer in response to the text to speech request signal.” As discussed above, neither Wu nor Osterman teaches or suggests these features.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Osterman and Walker. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Walker was relied upon as allegedly disclosing a second computer for generating a second collection of speech generation commands but fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu in view of Osterman discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is patentable over Wu in view of Osterman and Walker for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: April 9, 2009